# ENVIRONMENTALLY SPEAKING

What Today's Leaders Talk About

Volume 2, Issue 2 A Quarterly Army Environmental Policy Institute Publication March 2002


featured article

## Army Installation Energy Strategy for the Next 25 Years

by John Adams, jadams@aepi.army.mil

**Domestic energy production will not keep pace with the growing demand over the next decade...**

Army installations will face numerous challenges in energy management over the foreseeable future. The 1992 Energy Policy Act established federal energy efficiency goals. Executive Order (EO) 12902 subsequently made these goals more ambitious. In 1999, EO 13123 further increased these goals to a 35% energy reduction by 2010 and also required implementation of renewable energy projects. These EO goals are based on a 1985 energy consumption base line.

This spring, Congress U.S. will consider using year 2000 as the energy consumption baseline, which will add percentage points to existing energy efficiency goals as well as other requirements for the Army. As such, more energy EOs are expected to be forthcoming. In addition, Army Transformation creates new requirements and goals for installation "energy footprints". Finally, the FY00 Senior Environmental Leadership Conference (SELC) identified the need for Installation Sustainability Master Planning that establishes 25-year goals to include energy as an element of sustainability.

Factors "outside the fence" will also affect installation energy management: Domestic energy production will not keep pace with the growing demand over the next decade making the U.S. more dependent on world energy supplies and making the Army vulnerable to uncertain supplies and costs. Gas prices doubled the winter of 2001 largely due to inventory issues resulting in the Army overspending its budget by $100 million.

U.S. natural gas consumption is growing at an unprecedented rate as more electric power plants use gas as the fuel of choice to economically meet air quality standards. The Army is emphasizing using more natural gas and less electricity to improve its energy mix. To further complicate matters, energy *"re-regulation"* (which actually began in the 1960's) coupled with world energy markets has resulted in a history of "mismatches" between supply and demand resulting in energy shortages and price spikes. Impacts of recent terrorist attacks also underscore vulnerabilities in our energy supply infrastructure.

Clearly, DoD installations need an energy strategy that addresses existing and emerging issues that may degrade soldier/ civilian quality of life, mission and readiness. The strategy must also be flexible enough to anticipate and respond to the dynamics of energy supply in the face of changing Department of Defense needs and a changing energy market.

*This article is an excerpt from a report by John Adams that outlines a perspective on anticipated energy challenges ahead, and suggests the components of an energy strategy that will meet these challenges.*

*Mr. Adams is an IPA with AEPI.*

## INSIDE

# What is Centralized Installation Management (CIM)

The Honorable Thomas E. White, Secretary of the Army, has approved a plan to consolidate the management of Army installations under HQDA (Centralized Installation Management (CIM)) with an implementation date of 1 October 2002. Under this plan, the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) will be the principle military advisor to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment as well as provide streamlined, high-quality, reliable and, efficient services through an installation field operating activity and regional installation support centers. This concept will enable military commanders to divest themselves of most installation functions and focus on their primary mission to defend the Nation.

Proposed are a total of eight regional support centers including two OCONUS centers (Europe and the Pacific respectively) and six CONUS support centers generally aligned with current Federal Regions (FEMA, EPA, and USAR Regional Support Commands) and the proposed Army contracting and information management regions. These regions will be balanced by total number of installations, 20 – 26 in each, and number of Active Component installations, 16 – 20 each. Management of U.S. Army Reserve installations and reserve centers will be integrated into the CIM structure over time. Although there will be some integration of Army National Guard (ARNG) installation management staff at HQDA, the ARNG sites are not included in CIM due to unique relationships with in individual states and territories.

The responsibilities of garrison commanders may expand slightly but a major reorganization of Army garrisons is not anticipated in the initial reorganization. Garrison commanders will work for a specific Regional Director. The senior mission commander on the installation will have input through the garrison rating chain. An Installation Board of Directors consisting of MACOM Commanders and other senior leaders will provide oversight of the CIM process and represent mission support requirements.

The CIM system is patterned after a system of Base Support Battalions and Area Support Groups that allows mission commanders to focus on their core responsibilities of preparing, training, equipping and sustaining our soldiers and the force for war. This system was used successfully in Europe and proved effective during military operations in Bosnia.

Although Tables of Distribution and Allowances (TDAs) and assignments have not been finalized, there are no anticipated delays in ongoing installation or environmental initiatives, efforts and projects as a result of this reorganization. All should continue as planned. Personnel currently working at the installation level would continue to do so and local communities would continue to interact with the same staff as before.

Benefits of the CIM include: enhanced Army Transformation through more efficient, expedient means of handling installations' issues; streamlined funding of installation initiatives and projects; consistency in relating to regional, state and local governments, organizations and communities; and the consistent resolution of environmental issues. Quality of life for soldiers and their families will be enhanced through consistent management of facilities and family services such as housing, schools, child development centers, safety, recreational programs, and infrastructure as they move from one Army installation to another.

***

*For more information go to:*

http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsimweb/CIMhomepage.shtml

# Searching for Sustainability in an Encroaching and Transforming Environment

David S. Eady, Rochie E. Tschirhart and Ronald D. Webster, Army Environmental Policy Institute

Installation sustainability is a condition in which an installation is able to fully execute its present missions without compromising either the installation's ability to accomplish future missions or the ability of the installation's neighboring communities to realize their aspirations. Therefore, installation sustainability emphasizes mission requirements, while recognizing the linkages to establish and maintain that sustain readiness and ensure the long-term viability of our installations and communities.

Sustainability requires an integrated understanding of the significant issues that impede, or may do so in the future, our ability to maintain readiness and meet mission requirements. This is a complex task because these significant issues may emerge from any of the three primary dimensions of sustainability (economic, socio-political, environmental). Furthermore, we must frame any analysis within a specific footprint (spatial scale) and a specific timeframe (temporal scale). From this understanding, we can develop stationing plans and installation master plans to resolve these issues and move us toward sustainable operations and mission capabilities.

Sustainability planning and analysis must be approached from multiple levels: strategic stationing actions, installation planning processes, and integrated management systems. We suggest that implementing sustainability requires integrating its principles in a formal and explicit manner, within the decision-making processes at all three of these levels, not just any one of them on its own. This means that the value and impact of an effort to make sustainable stationing decisions for an installation will be substantially reduced if the installation's master plan is not framed within the context of sustainability and explicitly linked to the stationing plan. Similarly, a sustainable installation master plan is significantly diminished in its effectiveness if management systems and individual projects are not framed and developed within the context of sustainability.

Thus, stationing plans and analyses must incorporate sustainability principles into strategic-level decisions. This planning process should identify the breadth of stationing options, given the total asset inventory, and select the scenario that allocates military assets (people, equipment, facilities, ranges, etc.) to optimize mission capabilities. This process must address the ability to sustain those assets on viable installations over the long term. The Army Stationing Strategy also should provide guidance to future base realignment and closure (BRAC) processes, as proposed by the Efficient Facilities Initiative (EFI).

Sustainability analysis should identify reasonable (and viable) stationing options and evaluate alternative stationing scenarios. As a planning and decision-support document, stationing strategies should support strategic planning and decision-making, providing a general framework, and outlining the decision criteria (such as sustainability factors) for alternative evaluation.

Efficient, focused stationing planning and analysis should assess baseline conditions and produce an optimal match between national security objectives, programmed force structure, and existing installation infrastructure-to include all physical assets, both built and natural.

In turn, sustainable installations support military readiness into the indefinite future, without compromising environmental quality or community quality of life-both military and civilian, inside and outside the fence. Army installations must develop and implement an integrated long-range (25-years) strategy that will achieve this objective; and then develop, resource and execute short-range (5-years) action plans to transform, over time, into sustainable installations. Installation planners, analysts, residents, and operators must work creatively with surrounding communities to focus regional investments, including those of The Army, on collaborative planning and management activities that promote long-term sustainability of the installations and surrounding community.

The installation master plan—the comprehensive plan in civilian communities and the general plan in the Air Force—should integrate various planning and analysis requirements, eliminating redundancies and capitalizing on leveraged, combined resources and aligning community objectives. Master plans are the blueprint to guide the integrated systems or processes that manage objectives, prioritize resources, assign responsibilities and evaluate activities in support of a unified theme: installation sustainability.

Sustainability serves as a compass to focus installations on doing the right things (effectiveness), not just doing things right (efficiency). The installation master plan should integrate strategic planning across various installation components—e.g., facilities, infrastructure, ranges, ecosystems, etc.—analyzing impacts, assessing risks, and accounting for interrelationships among mission, socio-cultural, economic and environmental aspects, an original goal of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Using sustainability as an organizing principle, an " installation sustainability master plan" (ISMP) could concurrently meet the needs of both strategic master planning and NEPA. The ISMP is instituted through the installation's integrated management systems, based on the "ISO" architecture, providing structure and discipline to ensure implementation and evaluation toward the desired (sustainable) end-state.

This sustainability planning and implementation process should align and integrate installation strategic master planning with NEPA and ISO management standards (e.g., ISO 9000 and 14000) as part of a single, cost-effective (yet comprehensive) process that supports the long-term viability and sustainability of Army installations. And it is a process that should guide investments and provide a framework for the adaptive management of installations and continual improvement of operations.

# EARTH DAY AT ZOO ATLANTA

April 22, 2002

Every year, the Department of Defense sponsors Earth Day celebrations at Zoo Atlanta. Our 2002 event is just around the corner! Last year, Earth Day at Zoo Atlanta was a fantastic success.


The Army Environmental Policy Institute, along with the Southern Regional Environmental Office, US Army Reserve Command and US Forces Command will be on hand at the zoo in support of this year's event on April 22.

Every year students and families come to the Zoo to learn how various organizations help the environment and to participate in fun games and other activities.

If you are in the Atlanta area, please consider joining us for all the festivities and revisit Zoo Atlanta's panda pair, Lun Lun and Yang Yang.

The Zoo has a tent that will host twenty plus exhibitors to share our Earth Day information with over 20,000 adults and children. We hope that you are excited to participate with us this year.

We have many activities planned.

*Contact Keera Cleare at 404-524-9364 ext 279 for more information.*

website review...

## WWII POSTERS PROVE TO BE RELEVANT TODAY

During World War I and World War II the War Production Board and other agencies produced hundreds of posters encouraging soldiers and civilians to reduce waste and recycle material for the war effort.

Many of these posters are surprisingly relevant to today's Army. Some may prove useful in slide presentations when making the point that Army sustainability is far from a new concept.

You can search the official database of posters by keyword at the website of the National Archives and Records Administration, Still Picture Branch, at http://www.nara.gov/nara/searchnail.html.


# Health Risk Communication in the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program: Lessons for the Future

When Secretary of Defense William Cohen announced in 1997 that military service members would be vaccinated with the anthrax vaccine, no one anticipated widespread reluctance to accept the vaccine.

In his report, Col Bradley Freeman discusses the paradigm shift and the likelihood of society to question authority particularly in the area of medicine.

His paper suggests that a greater utilization of health risk communication techniques in the creation and implementation of the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP) would have helped the minimize questions, concerns, and resistance to the program.

Before discussing health risk communication lessons learned during development of the AVIP, this report presents information on anthrax and the anthrax vaccine, the decision to implement the immunization program and its aftermath, and an overview of risk communication.

*To receive a free copy of this or other AEPI publications, please contact Bob Jarrett at 404-524-9364 ext 271.*


**AEPI has an extensive list of published books on various environmental topics. Visit our website. All publications are FREE of charge.**

environmental conferences and training

**National Pollution Prevention Roundtable 2002 Spring Conference;** April 2-5, 2002. Portland, Oregon Contact: Ericka Alonso, National Pollution Prevention Roundtable Telephone: 202-466-7272 e-mail: ealonso@p2.org

**Terrorism and Technology - The Critical Role of IT**; June 11-13, 2002. Washington, D.C Convention Center. Sponsored by AFCEA International. Contact AFCEA Events at (703) 631-6125 or visit www.technet2002.org.

ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY INSTITUTE

*Attn: Environmentally Speaking*
*101 Marietta Street, Suite 3120*
*Atlanta, GA 30303-2720*

*Phone: 404-524-9364 ext 279*
*Fax: 404-524-9368*
*Email: Kcleare@aepi.army.mil*

WWW.AEPI.ARMY.MIL

The Army Environmental Policy Institute (AEPI) supports the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and the Environment (ASA-IE). AEPI assists in developing policies and strategies to improve or resolve environmental issues that may have significant short– and long-term impacts on the Army. Since environmental issues continue to emerge as our knowledge and technology develop, AEPI constantly reassesses future environmental challenges and opportunities for the Army. This unique quarterly newsletter was created with collaborative efforts of AEPI's staff to present emerging and current environmental issues that may impact Army policy. We encourage your feedback and welcome suggestions.

## AEPI PROGRAM AREAS

- ASA Support/Policy Research and Analysis
- Environmental Legislative/ Regulatory Analysis and Monitoring (ELRAMP)
- Installations and Facilities
- Conservation/Natural and Cultural Resources
- Pollution Prevention/ Energy/ Acquisition
- Emerging Non-Traditional Security Issues (ENSI)
- Cleanup and UXO Management
- Operations and Environmental Security